

### **Remarks**

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed November 4, 2009.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 4, 2009, Claims 1, 18-24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 42-49 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 18-24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 42-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,827, hereinafter Viswanath).

#### **II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments**

The present Response hereby amends Claims 1 and 49; cancels Claims 27 and 44-47; and adds new Claims 50-52, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 18-24, 26, 28-35, 37, 39, 42-43 and 48-52. Reconsideration of the Application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 18-24, 26-35, 37, 39 and 42-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,827, hereinafter Viswanath).

##### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 currently defines:

1. *A computer-readable storage medium containing instructions stored thereon, which when read and executed by a plurality of computers cause the plurality of computers to perform steps comprising:  
receiving, at an administrative server, an MBean definition file in a markup language format;  
generating, at the administrative server, an MBean archive file from the MBean definition file;  
sending the archive file from the administrative server to a managed server in a management domain, wherein the management domain is a collection of distributed servers that are managed as a unit, and wherein the managed server contains a logical canonical server used as a proxy for accessing an MBean server located on the managed server;  
using the archive file to instantiate a custom MBean upon the managed server, said custom MBean being customized for the managed server;*

*receiving a request for the MBean at a server residing in the management domain;  
determining a scope of the MBean, said scope having been specified in the MBean definition file or on a specific instance upon creation of said MBean, wherein the scope of the MBean is set to be either server-specific for the managed server or shared in the management domain, wherein the scope of the MBean is the set of locations at which the MBean is available, such that the MBean is unavailable to servers located outside of said scope of said MBean, wherein the managed server contains copies of the MBeans scoped server-specific to the managed server, and wherein the administration server contains copies of MBeans shared in the management domain and further contains an MBean index of all server-specific MBeans and all shareable MBeans;  
handling said request by said a server in the management domain; wherein if the MBean is server-specific and unavailable to the server receiving the request, said server receiving the request invokes a method to access the MBean index and accesses the logical canonical server corresponding to the managed server that the server-specific MBean resides on based on said MBean index; and  
providing a custom management capability through the MBean.*

As amended, Claim 1 more clearly defines the scoping and customization of MBeans. In particular, the scope of each MBean is a set of locations at which the MBean is available. The MBean is not available to servers outside of its scope. The scope of the MBean is either server-specific or shareable across the domain. The managed server in the domain contains the MBeans that are server-specific to that particular server. The administration server, on the other hand, contains the MBeans that are shareable. In addition, the administration server contains an MBean index list of all MBeans that are server-specific, as well as the shareable MBeans.

A request for an MBean can be received at a server in the management domain. The scope of the MBean is determined. The request is handled by the server, wherein if the MBean is server-specific and thus unavailable to the server handling the request, the server invokes a method to access the MBean index on the administration server. Based on this index, the receiving server can access the logical canonical server corresponding to the managed server on which the server-specific MBean resides. Once the custom MBean is accessed, the custom management capability is provided through the MBean.

Viswanath teaches a dynamic administration framework for server systems. More specifically, the new portions of Viswanath cited in the Office Action appear to disclose components representing business logic of the server (Viswanath, Abstract). Management beans include the business logic of the system (col. 19, lines 61-62). In addition, Viswanath mentions that "the administration framework may be compiled with application server or system-specific components."

(col. 15, lines 38-41, Abstract). In the Office Action, the Examiner's position was that Viswanath discloses both server specific and management domain scoped MBeans.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and further submits that Viswanath fails to disclose or render obvious the features defined in Claim 1, as currently amended.

In particular, the cited portion of Viswanath that states that "the administration framework may be compiled with application server or system-specific components" appears to be describing the fact that the administration can be generated using system-specific components (e.g. a compiler or application server). However, the mere fact that an administration framework can be compiled by using the application server or a system-specific component is not the same as an MBean that is set to be of a particular scope. In particular, there is no disclosure in Viswanath that an MBean is associated with a specific scope that is a set of locations where the MBean is available and where the MBean is unavailable to servers located outside of that scope, as defined in amended Claim 1. Moreover, there is no mention in Viswanath of the fact that the administration server contains MBeans of shared scope, while the managed server contains MBeans of server-specific scope, as defined in Claim 1.

In order to further differentiate Claim 1 from Viswanath, it has been amended to more clearly define that when a server in the domain receives a request for the MBean, *if the MBean is of server-specific scope and unavailable to the server receiving the request, said server receiving the request invokes a method to access the MBean index and accesses the logical canonical server corresponding to the managed server that the server-specific MBean resides on based on said MBean index*, as defined in amended Claim 1. Viswanath does not disclose that the administration stores only shareable MBeans but also maintains an index of all MBeans, including the server specific and shareable MBeans. Similarly, Viswanath does not access a logical canonical server if the MBean is server-specific scope and unavailable to the server receiving the request, as defined in Claim 1.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by Claim 1, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim 49**

Claim 49, while independently patentable, recites limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious

by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 1, 18-24, 26, 28-35, 37, 39 42-43, and 48**

Claims 1, 18-24, 26, 28-35, 37, 39, 42-43 and 48 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 18-24, 26, 28-35, 37, 39, 42-43 and 48 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**Claims 27 and 44-47**

The present Response hereby cancels Claims 27 and 44-47, thereby rendering moot any rejection as to these claims. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

**IV. Additional Amendments**

The present Response hereby adds new dependent claims 50-52. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 50-52 are fully supported by the Specification as originally filed and that no new matter is being added. Consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Application No.: 10/823,324  
Office Action dated: November 4, 2009  
Reply dated: February 4, 2010

Date: Feb. 4, 2010

By: /Justas Geringson/  
Justas Geringson  
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No. 80548  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800